



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/311,611	05/13/1999	FRANK B. NORMAN	SWA-3.2.016/	1463

7590 12/31/2002

COBRIN GITTES & SAMUEL  
750 LEXINGTON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

GRANT, CHRISTOPHER C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2611

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/311,611	NORMAN, FRANK B. <i>TD</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christopher Grant	<b>Art Unit</b> 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2002.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 22-36 and 38-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-36 and 38-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on 11/27/2002 have been disapproved because they introduce new matter into the drawings. 37 CFR 1.121(a)(6) states that no amendment may introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application. The original disclosure does not support the showing of a database (38) connected to a DBS server (30) now illustrated in amended figure 3.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 22-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aras et al. (Aras) in view of Slezak et al. (Slezak) (both of record).

Considering claims 22, 25, 33 and 38-39, Aras discloses a method and corresponding apparatus for monitoring a direct broadcast satellite (DBS) service subscriber's station to obtain audience rating measurements indicative of the DBS subscriber's viewing habits (BCT), comprising the steps of:

a) connecting a DBS subscriber station (111) to first network interface (1557, figure 15) (see col. 25, lines 7-17, col. 26, lines 33-41, col. 12, lines 40-54, col. 6, lines 30-44, col. 24, lines 29-42);

b) connecting a DBS server (101, 103, 121-BCC) to a second network interface necessary for communication over the local network (figure 4B);

c) transmitting a query message over the network from the DBS server to the subscriber's station; (col. 17, lines 57-63); and

d) enabling the service provider subscriber's station to respond to the query message by sending back statistics (behavior collection table, BCT) accumulated by the subscriber's station (and stored at the subscriber's station) to the DBS server (101,103,121), the statistics being related to the broadcast viewed by the subscriber (see the entire reference including but not limited to col. 12, line 40 - col. 14, line 24 and col. 17, lines 57-63).

Although Aras discloses communication over the Internet (at col. 26, lines 40-41) and a local distribution network separate from the satellite network (figure 4B), he fails to specifically disclose providing a full-time communication path between the first and second Internet interfaces involving an ISP and coordinating subscriber activities with schedule information as recited in the claims.

Slezak discloses a receiver (504,508) in communication with CATV server (510) via a cable network (74) and in full-time communication with the server (510) via an Internet network (530). An Internet interface at server (510), an Internet interface at receiver (504,508) and an Internet service provider (ISP) are all necessary components for communicating over the Internet. Slezak's system enables the receiver (504.508) to receive television programs and additional information via the Internet. The Internet communication provides bi-directional communication to the receiver (504,508). See the entire reference including but not limited to figure 1 and col. 4, line 65 - col. 5, line 60.

In Aras, a central facility (rating agency, content provider etc.) collects, collates, analyzes and processes the data retrieved from viewers for statistical purposes. The data collected are in a coded form as illustrated in figure 10. Therefore, at the central facility the data is collated or analyzed to determine or identify the programs watched. See the entire reference including but not limited to col. 1, line 50 – col. 2, line 56, col. 12, line 40 – col. 13, line 23, and col. 26, line 44 – col. 27, line 14.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Aras' system to include providing a full-time communication path between the first and second Internet interfaces and an ISP, as taught by Slezak, for the advantages of providing additional content from a server and to provide bi-directional communication between the receiver and the server.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined systems of Aras and Slezak to include coordinating subscriber activities with schedule information for the typical advantage of collating and/or analyzing viewers' data to determine or identify the programs watched by the viewers for statistical purposes.

Claims 23, 24, 34 and 36 are met by the combined systems of Aras and Slezak, wherein Aras discloses periodic transmission of the table or the table requested by the behavior collection center (BCC) when the data table is nearing full or any combination thereof in col. 17, lines 57-62.

Considering claim 26, the combined systems of Aras and Slezak disclose that the behavior collection table (BCT) comprises turn on (power on), tuned channel, time and channel

identification when changed, mute, turn off (power off), any combination of the above and timer events (See Aras at col. 14, lines 7-24).

However, the combined systems of Aras and Slezak fail to specifically disclose a time when the sound muting is applied and time when the sound muting is canceled as recited in the claim.

Collecting information about the time when the sound muting is applied and the time when the sound muting is canceled is more detailed than just collecting general mute information. The advantage of collecting more information is that a wide variety and/or large sample of subscriber viewing habits increases the accuracy of the statistical analysis performed by television market researchers (i.e. analyzing viewing habits information for determining the cost and effectiveness of television programs and commercials).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined systems of Aras and Slezak to include any viewing habit, such as a time when the sound muting is applied and time when the sound muting is canceled, because a wide variety and/or large sample of subscriber viewing habits increases the accuracy of the statistical analysis performed by television market researchers (i.e. analyzing viewing habits information for determining the cost and effectiveness of television programs and commercials).

Claim 27 is met by the combined systems of Aras and Slezak, wherein Aras discloses that the collected data table may be reported to the BCC on the fly (i.e. real time) in col. 17, lines 57-62.

Claims 28-30 are met by the combined systems of Aras and Slezak, wherein Aras discloses periodic transmission of the table or the table requested by the behavior collection center (BCC) when the data table is nearing full or any combination thereof in col. 17, lines 57-62.

As for claim 31, the combined systems of Aras and Slezak fail to specifically disclose posting the information to a World Wide Web page and the data collection point retrieves the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis as recited in the claim.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a first computing station (such as a subscriber terminal) to post information to a World Wide Web page and having a second computing station (such as a data collection point) to retrieve the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis. The advantages of this procedure are (1) it provides a central location for posting and retrieving data that is accessible to numerous users/vendors; (2) it utilizes a readily available technology; and (3) it is easy to implement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined systems of Aras and Slezak to include posting the information to a World Wide Web page and having the data collection point to retrieve the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis, for the advantages of providing a central location for posting and retrieving data that is accessible to numerous users/vendors and utilizing a readily available and easy to use technology.

Claim 32 is met by the combined systems of Aras and Slezak, wherein Aras discloses transferring information to the data collection point (BCC) in response to the query message received from the data collection point (Aras; col. 17, lines 57-63) via the Internet (Slezak).

Claim 35 is met by the combined systems of Aras and Slezak, wherein Aras discloses that the collected data table may be reported to the BCC on the fly (i.e. as the information is created) in col. 17, lines 57-62.

As for claim 40, the combined systems of Aras and Slezak fail to specifically disclose posting the information to a World Wide Web page and the data collection point retrieves the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis as recited in the claim.

The examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously well known in the art for a first computing station (such as a subscriber terminal) to post information to a World Wide Web page and having a second computing station (such as a data collection point) to retrieve the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis. The advantages of this procedure are (1) it provides a central location for posting and retrieving data that is accessible to numerous users/vendors; (2) it utilizes a readily available technology; and (3) it is easy to implement.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the combined systems of Aras and Slezak to include posting the information to a World Wide Web page and having the data collection point to retrieve the information from the World Wide Web page on a periodic basis, for the advantages of providing a central location for posting and retrieving data

that is accessible to numerous users/vendors and utilizing a readily available and easy to use technology.

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/23/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Response to applicant's arguments.

a) Applicant argues that "**Slezak bears a filing date that post-dates the priority date of the instant application by three months and three days**" on page 7, lines 8-9 of the amendment filed 10/23/2002.

In response, the Examiner posits that applicant is totally incorrect. The effective filing date of the instant application is 06/24/1996. The effective filing date of the Slezak reference is 9/29/1995. Therefore, Slezak pre-dates the instant application by over eight months.

b) Applicant argues that "**However, the Examiner takes no official notice as to when that became notoriously well known**" on page 10 (last paragraph).

(Response) First, the Examiner contends that the Internet and/or the World Wide Web were widely known before the effective filing date (6/24/1996) of Applicant's invention. It is a fact that the Internet and/or the World Wide Web involves one computing station (such as a subscriber terminal) posting information to a Web page and another computing station (such as a data collection point) retrieving the information from the Web page on a periodic or non-periodic basis.

Secondly, Slezak (a reference that pre-dates Applicant's filing date) also discloses using a computing device with a web browser to retrieve data from a Web page that contained information that was previously posted by another computing device. See col. 5, lines 33-54.

Thirdly, Dasan (newly cited) discloses a first computing station that posts information to a Web page and a second computing station that retrieves the information from the Web page on a periodic basis.

For all the above reasons, the Examiner concludes that Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Conclusion***

6. The following are suggested formats for either a Certificate of Mailing or Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). The certification may be included with all correspondence concerning this application or proceeding to establish a date of mailing or transmission under 37 CFR 1.8(a). Proper use of this procedure will result in such communication being considered as timely if the established date is within the required period for reply. The Certificate should be signed by the individual actually depositing or transmitting the correspondence or by an individual who, upon information and belief, expects the correspondence to be mailed or transmitted in the normal course of business by another no later than the date indicated.

**Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

on \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) \_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Please refer to 37 CFR 1.6(d) and 1.8(a)(2) for filing limitations concerning facsimile transmissions and mailing, respectively.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Grant whose telephone number is (703) 305 4755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on (703) 305-4380. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872 9314 for regular communications and (703) 872 9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Christopher Grant  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2611



CG  
December 27, 2002